To:
Ms. Kim Duffy
Principal Registrar
High Court Central Office
Four Courts
Dublin 7

Date: 3 February 2026

Subject: Complaint under Section 56, Courts Service Act 1998 – conduct of Conor D

Dear Ms. Duffy,

Be advised that I am fully familiar with the procedural requirements for judicial review applications.

The rejection notice drafted by your subordinate Conor D contains these errors:

1. My name was spelled incorrectly. The correct judicial spelling is Derek O'Barróid. Any other spelling is invalid and judicially worthless.

2. My address was misspelled. The correct address is Am Weidebaum, Bóthar na Duga, Luimneach, Éire. Any other version is invalid.

3. My country was rendered as Eire, a form that reduces it to a burden. The correct name of this sovereign state is Éire.

Further, I point out to the court and all its officers that I seek judicial review of the following repugnant behaviour:

harassment, wrongful incarceration, attempted murder by members of the Garda Síochána, the same harassment inside this very court, and repeated fobbing-off by your staff.

Further, Conor D rejected my affidavit on three further grounds:

- that it lacks a title: it is titled AFFIDAVIT. Order 84 does not require more.
  Order 40, Rule 7:
  "Every affidavit shall be entitled in the cause or matter in which it is sworn; but in every case in which there are more than one plaintiff or defendant, it shall be sufficient to state the full name of the first plaintiff or defendant, respectively, and that there are other plaintiffs or defendants as the case may be..."

  Order 84, Rule 20(2):
  "Such affidavit shall be entitled: THE HIGH COURT JUDICIAL REVIEW BETWEEN A.B.... APPLICANT AND C.D.... RESPONDENT."

- that the jurat omits an address: it now has it, not because he made it law, but because I do.
  Order 40, Rule 13(1):
  "Every affidavit shall state the description, trade, profession or employment of the deponent and: (i) the deponent's place of business... or (ii) the true place of abode of the deponent."

  Order 40, Rule 10:
  "Every person empowered by law to administer an oath shall express the date on which and the place where he takes any affidavit."

→ No mention of address *in the jurat*.

- that my passport must “state” a photograph: every passport contains one. Copies are attached. He can open his eyes.

Order 40, Rule 19(1)(c):
“that the identity of the deponent has been established by him by reference to a relevant document containing a photograph of the deponent before the affidavit was taken, and in a case to which paragraph (c) applies shall give particulars of the relevant document concerned.”

On 3 December 2025 the High Court accepted affidavit HP 2025/6439, sworn before M. Prosekina, Commissioner for Oaths, St. Mary’s Abbey Street, Dublin 7.

Since then I have endured harassment by Gardaí inside this very court. Those matters will be litigated.

Any further Mickey Mouse arguments from Conor D, Aoife Duffy or any official will be obstruction. The former Minister McEntee and the present Minister for Justice will answer for this obstruction alone.

Éire is a republic. I will not stand for any other form of law.

Yours sincerely,

Derek O’Barróid
Am Weidebaum
Bóthar na Duga
Luimneach
Éire

Topic	Description	Key Elements	Related Sections in Final Document
Amendments for EU and International Law	Added references to EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (e.g., Articles 3, 47), Treaty on European Union (successor to Treaty of Rome), Völkerrecht, and German Grundgesetz (Articles 19(4), 104, 25). Emphasized that these are binding national law per Bunreacht na hÉireann Articles 15.2 and 29.	- Integrated into averments for multiple accused to strengthen constitutional arguments. - Highlighted sovereignty ("Harp without a crown").	Incorporated in averments across sections, e.g., paragraphs 3, 8, 17, 22, 24, 37, 43, 48, 53, 58, 63, 68, 73, 78, 83, 88, 90, 91.
Adding Ombudsman and HSE Staff	Expanded the complaint to include Ger Deering (Ombudsman), Ann O'Sullivan (HSE), and Elaine Brady (Early Resolution Unit) for failing to investigate complaints,	- Reasons: Refusal to probe arbitrary incarceration and unredacted files. - Tied to s.41 obstruction of justice.	Paragraphs 63-73 (Ger Deering), 74-78 (Ann O'Sullivan), 79-83 (Elaine Brady).

Topic	Description	Key Elements	Related Sections in Final Document
	withholding files, and claiming no jurisdiction, citing Mental Health Act 2001 s.12 and Ombudsman Act 1980.		
Judge Patricia Harney Section	Detailed charges against Judge Harney for remand without interpreter/solicitor, permitting Garda harassment, claiming ultra vires jurisdiction, refusing files. Called for striking off, referencing nemo iudex in causa sua and ECHR Article 6.	- Dates: 9 June 2025 (remand), 10 December 2025 (harassment). - Linked to Garda Act 2005 s.7(1).	Paragraphs 29-37.
Judge Carol Anne Coolican Section	Charged Coolican for "no order" ruling, reincarceration, ignoring injuries, using "I" pronoun (repugnant to Grundgesetz Article 101), refusing mandamus/habeas corpus. Called for striking off, referencing dictatorial positions in a democratic republic.	- Dates: 10 June 2025 ("no order"), 11 June 2025 (reproduction in court). - Tied to ECHR Article 6, Bunreacht Articles 15.2/29.	Paragraphs 38-43.
Minister Jim O'Callaghan Section	Charged the Minister for incompetence in overseeing Garda (likened to RUC/SA/Stasi), failing to reform legislation, referencing Kästner poem and historical analogies (Buchenwald, Nuremberg, Burgundian Wars, Gulags). Incorporated custom Garda oath and economic argument against riot gear/positions.	- Statutes: Garda Act 2005 s.7(1), Bunreacht Preamble/Article 9.3, Le Lievre v Gould [1893], Courts Service Act 1998 s.5(1)(e), Braddish v DPP [2001]. - Added long historical caveat and oath as paragraphs.	Paragraphs 84-91.
Limerick Prison Governor Section	Charged the Governor for accepting incarceration without notification of reasons, exposing to substandard cells, strip search, threats, abuse, medical interference. Referenced Prison Rules 2007 (Rules 4, 6, 11, 33), Prisons Act 2007 s.3.	- Date: 9 June 2025 onward. - Name: Mr. Mark Kennedy (per Irish Prison Service).	Paragraphs 92-96 (new section added, renumbered accordingly).

High Court Central Office
Four Courts
Dublin 7

Dear Sir or Madam,

I, Derek O'Barróid, of
Am Weidebaum, Bóthar na Duga, Luimneach, Éire,

Re: Affidavit: abject failure of the rule of law in the European Union , repugnant to Article 67 TEU and the Lisbon Treaty, pacta sunt servanda. [TEU 67; Lisbon Art 2]

hereby make affidavit and application for consolidation of all matters touching upon High Court record **HP 2025.6439 filed 3 December 2025**, and all ancillary applications.

These include email applications lodged over the last two months, particularly since 10 December 2025 , the seventy-seventh anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document largely unheeded and directionally ignored. On that day, after being called by Judge Harney, I was harassed by Gardai in open court. [Art 6 ECHR]

The duty of the Garda Síochána is not to be unnecessarily present in courtrooms. Their duty has been legislated for in the Garda Síochána Act 2005, section seven, and in the behaviour regulations of 2024 and 2025. Harassment of a person approaching the bench is not one of their duties. [Art 3 ECHR]

Nor is it their duty to accept documents directed to the registrar for the sitting judge. The object of this judicial review is to examine the competence of the Garda Síochána in interpreting legislation between upholding the law, vindication, and professing criminality. [Art 34.1 BnÉ]

The duties of the court under Article 34.1 of Bunreacht na hÉireann are in connection with Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights. [BnÉ 34.1; ECHR 6]

The duties of the Court Service are set out in statute and in Article 47 of the European Charter of Fundamental Rights , national law through Articles 15.2 and 29 of Bunreacht na hÉireann. [Courts Act 1998; CFR 47; BnÉ 15.2, 29]

Not only must courts be impartial, the court service owes me a duty of care. This review also examines the incompetence of previous Ministers in enacting non-constitutional regulations contrary to the common good , regulations that turned the turbulent seventies and eighties, when a Renault 4 sufficed, into today's water-cannon, taser, riot-gear state. [BnÉ 40.3; CFR 52]

Since my arbitrary deportation from the Federal Republic of Germany, I have been arbitrarily detained, harassed, incarcerated, almost murdered, and attacked in the cell by members of the Garda Síochána. [ECHR 5, 3, 8]

I respect the uniform , not necessarily the man wearing it, but out of brotherhood I offer him basic respect and protection under the rule of law. The uniform is protected by the Geneva Convention. The man's dignity is vindicated by the courts. [BnÉ 40.3.2; ECHR 3]

It is the duty of the court to vindicate the man , and thereby lift society above the promiscuous squalor of barbarity. I hold locus standi under Article 9.3 of Bunreacht na hÉireann. [BnÉ 9.3]

I can defend myself, even against these blue shirts, but I choose to do so judicially, before an open court, under the Harp without a crown, under the rule of law. Therefore, for these proceedings, we call this affidavit. To amuse Mr. Conor D., we highlight the abject failure of the rule of law in the European Union , repugnant to Article 67 TEU and the Lisbon Treaty, pacta sunt servanda. [TEU 67; Lisbon Art 2]

Mr. D's retort is unsigned; there is no judicial redress possible because the person is not identifiable. This paper is non-contractual and therefore non-constitutional. [BnÉ 15.2.1]

It is evidence of a perversion of justice. Equally, the retorts by Ms. D on 3 December are unsigned, unconstitutional, and as necessary to identify Aoife in a lineup with other alleged criminals. The Petty Sessions Act 1851, section ten, prescribes that all information must be accepted by the judge. [PSA 1851, s10]

All information is the words. The words are the information. The necessity for a Commissioner for Oaths to sign a document is without further requirement, appraisal also noted and rejected by Mr. D and Ms. D. Obviously the solicitor is soliciting his ten euros without accountability. [Solicitors Act 1954, s58 TCA 1997, s18]

If the man signs the document and is not aware that the wording must contain "containing a photograph", for what purpose is he there? [Juries Act 1927, s9]

In the Federal Republic of Germany, the Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch sets forth that solicitors are service contractors, and in civil procedure, the litigant is responsible for failures of the qualified solicitor. Maybe, if the court is not capable of understanding, that makes a complete cock-up of the system. Just imagine, if your toilet is blocked, do you call a qualified tradesman or a solicitor to fix the blockage? [Consumer Rights Act 2022]

The tradesman is a work contractor and he guarantees his work. The solicitor, so if your bathroom floods with your own faeces, you are responsible for that failure. [BGB § 280]

And considering the Roman Latin premise that the court knows the law, for what purpose do we have these sons and daughters of the province who manage to get a law degree? It is obvious the tradition calls that I instruct the solicitor, who in turn instructs the barrister, who speaks at the court. Who has the right to the impartial court's ear, the barrister or the plaintiff?

I point out to the court that in a democracy only the emptying of a ballot box guarantees the position of a minister.

No other competences are necessary. It is my duty as a democrat, as a republican, to expose the abject failures of these ballot-box empties. In the solemn execution of electoral duty, the officer empties the ballot box with all the gravity of a chamberlain emptying the privy, yet whereas the latter rids the palace of its ordure, the former often preserves the stench, and multiplies it by statute.

Derek O'Barróid
3 February 2026

Affidavid: abject failure of the rule of law in the European Union , repugnant to Article 67 TEU and the Lisbon Treaty, pacta sunt servanda. [TEU 67; Lisbon Art 2]

Pursuant to Section 10 of the Petty Sessions (Ireland) Act 1851 and Order 15, Rule 1 of the District Court Rules, I, Derek O'Barróid, make sworn complaint and respectfully apply that summonses issue against the persons hereinafter named for offences committed within the jurisdiction of this Court.

I say:

Whenever one person is by circumstances placed in such a position with regard to another, that everyone of ordinary sense who did think would at once recognise that if he did not use ordinary care and skill in his own conduct with regard to those circumstances he would cause danger of injury to the person or property of the other, a duty arises to use ordinary care and skill to avoid such danger. A person is entitled to be as negligent as he pleases toward the whole world if he owes no duty to them.

One must take reasonable care to avoid acts or omissions which you can reasonably foresee would be likely to injure your neighbour. The person so affected is my neighbour in law. A local authority owes a common duty of care in the course of its operations to members of the public who will be physically affected by those operations.

Firstly, it shall be tested, is there a relationship between the parties such that carelessness on the part of the one is likely to cause damage to the other?

Secondly, it shall be tested; is there any consideration which ought to negative or to reduce the duty?

Therefore, before any duty can arise there must be foreseeability, proximity, and what is fair, just and reasonable.

The Garda Síochána have a duty, enacted under section 7 of the Garda Síochána Act 2005 by Senior Counsel Michael McDowell when Attorney General and Minister for Justice to investigate every offence. against the following successive Ministers for Justice (2005 to present):

– Michael McDowell
– Brian Lenihan
– Dermot Ahern
– Alan Shatter
– Frances Fitzgerald
– Charlie Flanagan
– Helen McEntee
– Jim O'Callaghan

From the Preamble of Bunreacht na hÉireann the State pledges fidelity to the common good; Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights binds that good to brotherhood. To stand aside from a neighbour's wound is to break both constitutions.

Derek O'Barróid
3 February 2026

EX PARTE MOTION
HIGH COURT OF IRELAND
RECORD NO. HP 2025.6439

I, Derek O’Barróid, applicant in person, do hereby move this Honourable Court ex parte for the following reliefs:

The essence of judicial duty demands that no conflict of law be presumed unless unavoidable; that proceedings remain open to the public; and that no individual, least of all the citizen before the bar, be left unprotected by secret process or silent court.

Therefore, this Court, as guardian of the Constitution, must extend its shield not only to my person but to the very State, lest the rule of law itself, stripped of voice, be left bleeding on the steps of justice.

1. An order admitting the applicant as next friend to the State, the successive Ministers for Justice since 2005 having failed to nominate or maintain a proper respondent.

2. An order that all filings in HP 2025.6439 be deemed filed against the State at large, or against the following successive Ministers for Justice (2005 to present):
– Michael McDowell
– Brian Lenihan
– Dermot Ahern
– Alan Shatter
– Frances Fitzgerald
– Charlie Flanagan
– Helen McEntee
– Jim O'Callaghan

3. An order that the following further be named respondents:
– The President of Ireland,
– The successive Attorneys General since 2005,
– The Director of Public Prosecutions —

each bound by oath to defend the Constitution and therefore holding locus standi to refuse assent to unconstitutional legislation. They did not. We do not need ball-less people.

4. An order for expedition of hearing, the matter being urgent in the vindication of Article 40.3 Bunreacht na hÉireann and Article 6 ECHR.

5. As to costs: the conduct complained of is constitutional and criminal. It is repugnant to Article 40.4.1° Bunreacht na hÉireann. There are no financial costs — only the cost of dignity, and the cost of the rule of law.

6. An order directing the Director of Public Prosecutions to ascertain and furnish to the Court, and thence to the applicant, the correct and current addresses for service of summonses upon the named respondents, so that proper delivery may be effected in accordance with the Rules of the Superior Courts. Personal investigation by the applicant could be construed as harassment.

7. An order that no respondent shall attempt to contact the applicant, his family or associates, in any manner whatsoever — such contact being without legal ability and capable of being construed as harassment.

8. The Court is required to accept this affidavit on my personal oath – I being over eighteen years of age and fully aware of the consequences of perjury. If not satisfied, the Court must appoint a Commissioner for Oaths capable of understanding his duty to the Court, to the person, and to the State.

9. Such further or other relief as the nature and circumstances of the case may require.

Grounds:

1. Article 9.3 Bunreacht na hÉireann – locus standi of every citizen to challenge government.

2. Article 6 ECHR – fair trial; Garda obstruction violates.

3. Article 40.3 Bunreacht – duty of court to vindicate rights.

4. Article 40.4.1 Bunreacht – repugnant behaviour by Ministers.

5. Commissioners for Oaths Act 1872 s.5 – affidavit valid on my oath if court accepts; else appoint commissioner.

6. Garda Síochána Act 2005 s.7 – duty to investigate, not harass.

7. Judicial Review Act 2000 s.5 – court may supply missing respondent.

8. Successive Ministers liable for cumulative policy failure.

Derek O'Barróid
3 February 2026